		U 015608-9
1 1 -03- 2004 TENT COOPERA	ATION TREAT	Y
ign.: rom the NTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORIT	· Y	PCT
Го:		28 JAN 200
Cermak, Karel Cermák Horejs Myslil a spol. Národn 32	· .	WRITTEN OPINION
110 00 Prague 1 REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE		(PCT Rule 66)
·		9.0°
	Date of mailing (day month year)	09/03/2004
Applicant's or agent's file reference	REPLY DUE	within 2 / 00 months/days
01-1748-03-Ce	f	within 2 / 00 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. International filing date	e (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/CZ03/00045 11/08/2003		13/08/2002
nternational Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classificati	ion and IPC	
A01D34/68		
Applicant		
DVORAK, Lubomir		
I X Basis of the opinion II Priority III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelt IV Lack of unity of invention V X Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard	ard to novelty, inventive	
citations and explanations supporting such statemen	nt	
VII Certain defects in the international application		
VIII Certain observations on the international application	on.	
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion. When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d). How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where ap For the form and the language of the amendments, see	, before the expiration oppropriate, by amendme	
Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments,	s and/or arguments, see	Rule 66.4 <i>bis</i> .
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments For an informal communication with the examiner, se		
	port will be established:	on the basis of this opinion.
For an informal communication with the examiner, se If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination re		on the basis of this opinion.
For an informal communication with the examiner, se If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination re		/2004



I. Basis of the opinion

- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- 1. In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.